REMARKS

Claims 28-48 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action dated November 8, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

A.)   Rejected claims 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 40, 42, 43, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore, et al. (U.S. 6,875,102)("Bickmore")*.

B.)   Rejected claims 30-32, 37-39, and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore* in view of *Smith, et al. (U.S. 5,212,770)("Smith")*.

C.)   Rejected claims 34, 41, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore* in view of *Kursh (U.S. 2001/0032076)*.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below. Claims 28, 35, and 42 have each been amended to correct informalities.

A.)   <u>Rejection of claims 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 40, 42, 43, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bickmore, et al. (U.S. 6,875,102)("Bickmore")*</u>:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 28, 35, and 42 each claim subject matter relating to converting a word processing document to a compact word processing document format. Style information is extracted from the word processing document. The style information includes a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery, and is stored in a first record. Text is extracted from the word processing document. The extracted text and run information is stored in a second record. The run information describes locations in the text where the style information is to be applied.

This is clearly unlike *Bickmore*, which *Bickmore* fails to disclose or suggest extracting a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery from a word processing document. The Examiner

argues that *Bickmore* 8:53-65 teaches this claimed subject matter, however, the cited passage

fails to relate to this claimed subject matter. *Bickmore* 8:41-65 describes that *Bickmore* uses an

Indexed Segment transform to scan a web document (*e.g.*, a web page) to identify elements on a

page that can be logically partitioned, such as paragraphs, lists, or tables. The transform

segments a document page into sub-pages that are easier to fit onto a smaller screen. Each sub-

page includes as many of the identified elements as possible until the sub-page is filled up.

Bickmore 8:43-52. For example, three out of five paragraphs of the original page may fit into the

sub-page.

In *Bickmore's* transform, "as much style information as possible is retrained for the

output elements" by outputting the output element with its ancestor's HTML tags. *Bickmore*

8:53-54. Thus, *Bickmore* keeps track of HTML tags that were present in the original web page.

Unlike Applicants' claimed invention, nowhere does *Bickmore* disclose or suggest extracting a

paragraph style gallery from a word processing document. Instead, *Bickmore* merely keeps track

of HTML web page tags. *Bickmore* fails to discuss paragraph style galleries, let alone extracting

a paragraph style gallery from a word processing document.

For at least these reasons, *Bickmore* fails to disclose or suggest claims 28, 35, and 42.

Claims 29, 33, 36, 40, 43, and 47 depend directly or indirectly from claims 28, 35, or 42

and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be

withdrawn.

B.)   Rejection of claims 30-32, 37-39, and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

       unpatentable over *Bickmore* in view of *Smith, et al. (U.S. 5,212,770)("Smith")*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable over *Bickmore* as discussed above.

Smith still fails to disclose or suggest extracting a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery

from a word processing document. Therefore, *Bickmore* in view of *Smith* still fails to disclose or

suggest claims 28, 35, and 42.

Claims 30-32, 37-39, and 44-46 depend directly or indirectly from claims 28, 35, or 42

and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be

withdrawn.

C.)   Rejection of claims 34, 41, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

       Bickmore in view of *Kursh (U.S. 2001/0032076)*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable over *Bickmore* as discussed above.

Kursh still fails to disclose or suggest extracting a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery

from a word processing document. Therefore, *Bickmore* in view of *Kursh* still fails to disclose or

suggest claims 28, 35, and 42.

Claims 34, 41, and 48 depend directly or indirectly from claims 28, 35, or 42 and are

therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 28, 35, and 42 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be

withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the

cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/_____
       Christopher P. Rauch
       Reg. No. 45,034

Customer Number: 58328
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Phone: (312) 876-8000
Fax: (312) 876-7934